DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 978 HE 017 829

AUTHOR Payan, Rose M.; And Others
TITLE Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest: Replication after 10 Years. College Board Report No. 84-3.
INSTITUTION College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.; Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
REPORT NO ETS-RR-84-17
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 40p.; For the earlier study, see ED 067 015.
AVAILABLE FROM College Board Publications, Box 886, New York, NY 10101 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Access to Education; Ancillary School Services; College Bound Students; *College Students; *Enrollment Trends; Geographic Regions; Higher Education; *Mexican Americans; Questionnaires; Student Attrition; *Student Financial Aid; *Student Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS *United States (Southwest)

ABSTRACT

The enrollment of Mexican Americans in college, services to this population, and their achievements were studied in 1982, as a replication of a 1972 study. In addition to presenting comparable results of the two surveys, attention is directed to recent literature on Hispanic access and achievement as well as critical issues that need to be addressed. Information is provided on: total undergraduate and Mexican American enrollment in southwestern colleges in fall 1970 and fall 1980 by state and college type; factors that limit enrollment of Mexican American students, as reported by colleges; percentages of colleges using various strategies to recruit Mexican American students by type of college; average amounts of undergraduate aid available to institutions in 1971 and 1981 by college type; average estimates of grant, loan, and job aid awarded to Mexican American undergraduates in 1970 and 1980 by college type; ratings of possible problems affecting Mexican American students needing financial aid; percentage of colleges that provide various student support programs and services by college type; judged importance of factors that may affect academic achievement and attrition of Mexican American students; and average number of full-time Mexican American professional staff per institution. The study questionnaire is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED250978

College Board
Report

No. 84-3

Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest: Replication after 10 Years

Rose M. Payán
Richard E. Peterson
Nancy A. Castille

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEEB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AE 017 821

Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest: Replication after 10 Years

Rose M. Payán
Richard E. Peterson
Nancy A. Castille

Educational Testing Service

College Board Report No. 84-3

ETS RR No. 84-17

College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1984

Rose M. Payán is a field service representative with the Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, California.

Richard E. Peterson is a field service representative with the Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, California.

Nancy A. Castille is an administrative secretary with the Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, California.

The authors wish to acknowledge the seminal role of Alfredo de los Santos, Vice Chancellor for Educational Development at the Maricopa Community Colleges, in launching both the 1972 and 1982 surveys.

Dedication

The authors wish to dedicate this report to the memory of Tomás Rivera, Chancellor of the University of California at Riverside at the time of his death, whose career was dedicated to the educational advancement of Hispanic youth.

Researchers are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in College Board Reports do not necessarily represent official College Board position or policy.

The College Board is a nonprofit membership organization that provides tests and other educational services for students, schools, and colleges. The membership is composed of more than 2,500 colleges, schools, school systems, and education associations. Representatives of the members serve on the Board of Trustees and advisory councils and committees that consider the programs of the College Board and participate in the determination of its policies and activities.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from College Board Publications, Box 886, New York, New York 10101. The price is $5.

Copyright © 1984 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.
The "College Board" and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Entrance Examination Board.
Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

Abstract v

Introduction 1
- The 1972 Survey 1
- The 1982 Survey 1

Recent Literature on Hispanic Access and Achievement 2

Critical Issues 4

Findings from the 1982 Survey 6
- Enrollment 6
- Recruitment 10
- Financial Aid 11
- Programs and Services 13
- Achievement 15
- Attrition 16
- Faculty and Student Services Personnel 16
- Future Commitment to Mexican American Students 16

Summary and Implications 16
- Enrollment 17
- Recruitment 17
- Financial Aid 17
- Programs and Services 18
- Faculty and Student Services Personnel 18
- Achievement and Attrition 18
- Future Commitment 18
- Greater Effort Needed by Colleges, Schools, and Mexican American Families 18
- English Language Proficiency 19

References 19

Appendixes 20
- A. Advisory Committees 20
- B. The 1972 Questionnaire 21
- C. The 1982 Questionnaire 23
- D. Survey Respondents: 1972 and 1982 28

Tables

1. Enrollment. Total Undergraduate and Mexican American Enrollment in Southwestern Colleges in Fall 1970 and Fall 1980—By State and College Type (in thousands) 7

2. Enrollment. Percentage of Colleges that Indicated Various Factors that Limit the Enrollment of Mexican American Students—By College Type 8

3. Enrollment. Judged Importance of Possible Barriers to Mexican American Attendance in College—All Colleges Combined (1982 Survey Only) 8

4. Recruitment. Percentages of Colleges Using Various Strategies to Recruit Mexican American Students—By College Type 9

5. Recruitment. Percentages of Public Colleges in Selected Counties Using Various Strategies to Recruit Mexican American Students for Fall 1972 and Fall 1982—By College Level 10

Tables (Continued)

6. Recruitment. Percentage of Colleges that Undertook Various Special Procedures in 1971–72 and 1981–82 in an Effort to Enroll More Mexican American Students—By College Type 10

7. Recruitment. Percentage of Public Colleges in Selected Counties that Undertook Various Procedures in 1971–72 and 1981–82 in an Effort to Enroll More Mexican American Students—By College Level 11

8. Financial Aid. Average Amounts of Undergraduate Aid Available to Institutions in 1971–72 and 1981–82—By College Type (data in thousands) 11

9. Financial Aid. Average Estimates of Grant, Loan, and Job Aid Awarded to Mexican American Undergraduates in 1970–71 and 1980–81—By College Type 12

10. Financial Aid. Ratings of Possible Problems Affecting Mexican American Students Needing Financial Aid—By College Type 12

11. Financial Aid. Ratings by Financial Aid Officers in Public Colleges in Selected Counties of Possible Problems Affecting Mexican American Students Needing Financial Aid—By College Level 13

12. Programs and Services. Percentages of Colleges that Provide Various Students Support Programs and Servics—By College Type 14

13. Programs and Services. Percentages of Public Colleges in Selected Counties that Provide Various Student Support Programs and Services 14

14. Achievement. Judged Importance of Various Factors that May Affect Academic Achievement of Mexican American Students—All Colleges Combined (1982 Survey Only) 15

15. Attrition. Judged Importance of Various Factors that May Affect Attrition Among Mexican American Students—All Colleges Combined (1982 Survey Only) 15

16. Faculty and Student Services. Average Number of Full-Time Mexican American Professionals per Institution (1982 Survey Only) 16

17. Future Commitment to Mexican American Students. Anticipated Change in Institutional Commitment to Mexican American Students 16

ABSTRACT

This article is based on a 1982 survey of Hispanic higher education enrollment and related practices and issues. Addressed to financial aid officers in five southwestern states, it was a replication of a similar study carried out in 1972. In addition to presenting comparable results from the two surveys, the article reviews recent literature, comments on critical issues in Hispanic access, and outlines a number of implications from the study for expanding access to college on the part of Hispanic youth.

INTRODUCTION

Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest,[1] written in 1972, was something of a milestone study. It provided perhaps the first systematic glimpse of the extent to which Mexican American youth were enrolling in higher education institutions, together with information about amount and types of financial aid received, recruitment practices, special support services, and perceived barriers to increased access.

The general purpose of this—the 1982 project—is to replicate, ten years later, the 1972 survey. Thus, we will present data based on the same questions, and point to various trends during the past decade in the accommodation of Mexican Americans by colleges and universities in the Southwest. We will also comment briefly on the important and expanding research literature concerning Hispanic access to higher education and point to what seem to us to be the critical problems—or challenges—if headway is to be made in resolving the overarching problem of continuing serious underrepresentation of Mexican Americans (and other minorities[2]) in higher education.

The 1972 Survey

Before describing the earlier survey, it is interesting to take note of the educational and political climate at the time. The late 1960s and early 1970s are frequently—wistfully—called the halcyon years of modern American higher education. It was a period of unparalleled expansion. And it was a time—in the wake of the civil rights advances of the 1960s—of unprecedented concern for extending higher education opportunities to previously underserved populations. The climate on the campuses, buoyed by generous federal and state legislatures and a reasonably sympathetic citizenry (the student protests of the 1960s fading from memory), was one of uncommon optimism and idealism.

The objective of the 1972 survey was to "provide information on enrollment patterns, recruitment and support practices, and barriers to higher education for Mexican American students in the Southwest." Precise topics to be covered in the survey were defined by a committee of university administrators, faculty, admissions personnel, and officials from community agencies (Appendix A: Southwestern Committee). Their assumption was that improved knowledge in these areas would lead to expanded efforts to increase Mexican American representation in the colleges, to improve the quality of their college experience, and to identify factors that impede their educational progress.

A two-page questionnaire (Appendix B) was mailed to the financial aid director at 189 institutions in the five Southwestern states (Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas). This sample included all institutions except that one-third of the two-year and private colleges in Texas and California were chosen randomly. Aid officers were asked to consult with other staff members on particular questionnaire items as necessary. One hundred fifty-three (153) campuses responded, for an 81 percent return rate (Appendix D).

Planners of the survey felt that it was also important to examine access issues at colleges in geographical areas where relatively large numbers of Mexican Americans reside and attend college. Twenty-eight counties, each having over 50,000 Mexican Americans, were identified, and data for institutions in these counties were analyzed separately (with private colleges excluded because of insufficient numbers).

The 1982 Survey

A decade later, the climate of opinion in the country has substantially changed. The increasingly poor performance of the economy was accompanied by a mood of fiscal conservatism—as manifested, for example, in tax reduction measures such as California's Proposition 13—that led to reduced funding for education at all levels, as well as for other government services. Thus in the past five years, colleges and universities have been faced with ever-deeper budget cuts and consequently the need for ever-stiffer retrenchment. At the same time, partly in consequence, a new concern for "quality" has widely taken hold in academe: this has typically meant a return to higher standards (as in required pre-college preparation of applicants) and in moves to eliminate remedial work (in which minority students are disproportionately enrolled). Again, the mood of the public is generally supportive.

Finally, 1983 saw the release of several major reports

---

1. Designed and carried out by Richard Ferrin, Richard Jonsen, and Cesar Trimble, the project was part of a series of higher education surveys conducted by the College Board through what was called the Access Research Office (located at the Board's Palo Alto, California, office).
2. Many of the findings and conclusions reported here apply to the other minority populations in the U.S. Only American Indians, according to the preponderance of data, are more underrepresented than Mexican Americans in the educational pipeline. Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Central Americans—the other populations generally included under the "Hispanic" and "Latino" rubics—as well as blacks, seem to be faring slightly better than Mexican Americans (Chicanos).

aimed at achieving "excellence" in and otherwise reforming the schools, particularly the secondary schools. In general, their recommendations center on ways to raise standards. Very seldom, however, have the reports dealt with how to achieve excellence in educating minority youth in the secondary schools,[3] which, as we will see, is the key to expanding Mexican American (and other minority student) access to higher education. As of this writing, a tide of concern for reform of the schools is sweeping the country. Unfortunately, seemingly lost in all the outcry is what to do about—how to teach—the burgeoning minority populations.

The 1982 survey reflects the College Board's continued concern for improving the education of minority students. Interest in repeating the 1972 project goes back to a 1979 meeting in Phoenix, Arizona, that included Board President Robert J. Kingston and some 50 Mexican American educators from the five Southwestern states. Among the many ideas for new or improved Board services discussed was the idea of replicating the 1972 access study.

A small advisory group (Appendix A) reviewed the contents of the original survey instrument for appropriateness in 1982. This group also suggested adding a number of new questions chiefly on issues related to Mexican American student attrition and achievement, and to the training of financial aid officers.[4] Thus the 1982 questionnaire (Appendix C) included the nine questions from the 1972 form and seven additional items.

The instrument was mailed to financial aid officers at the 189 institutions surveyed in 1972. Responses were forthcoming from 99 campuses only, even after intensive follow-up efforts. Sixty-six institutions responded to both the 1972 and 1982 surveys.

One reason for the lower (52 percent) response rate on the second survey was the extreme uncertainty at the time surrounding levels of federal student financial aid; numerous aid officers, when contacted about the survey, said they simply could not answer questions, for example, about expected amounts of aid. It is also possible that a declining priority for minority access on some campuses affected the return rate; a common reason given for not responding was that financial aid information was not (or is no longer) kept in the manner requested by the survey (separate records on aid to Mexican American students).

At any rate, because of the relatively low 1982 return rate, and the differences in the composition of the two samples, considerable care must be taken in interpreting some of the results. Pertinent information on the two samples are in Appendix D, and several cautions on interpretation are discussed at the beginning of the section "Findings from the 1982 Survey."

RECENT LITERATURE ON HISPANIC ACCESS AND ACHIEVEMENT

To provide further background for the issues and research findings to be discussed, it will be useful to review several major contributions to the research literature on the experience of Mexican Americans and Hispanics in American schools and colleges. Four reports are especially noteworthy.

1. *The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans* (Brown et al. 1980) was the work of three staff members of the National Center for Education Statistics, assisted by Michael Olivas who was then with the LULAC[5] National Educational Service Centers, Inc. Drawing on 1970s data from several major sources, they compiled an extremely comprehensive picture (some 112 tables and a similar number of charts) of Hispanics in the U.S. and the extent, nature, and outcomes of their participation in education at all levels.

The report, among other things, documents the geographical concentrations of Hispanics (75 percent live in five states, and mostly in central cities), the typical household use of Spanish, and the relative economic poverty of Hispanic families. Two-thirds of Hispanic students attend elementary and secondary schools that are predominantly minority, and nationally they fail to complete high school at twice the rate of whites (with the dropout rate of Mexican Americans especially high).

In higher education, while participation increased during the 1960s and 1970s, Hispanics were seen to still be seriously underrepresented at all levels, and to be concentrated in two-year community colleges.

2. *Chicanos in Higher Education: Progress and Attainment* (Astin and Burciaga 1982)[6] is an extensive analysis of the data on Chicanos compiled for the Ford Foundation's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) project on minorities in higher education. Ninety-one percent of Chicanos were found to reside in six states (California, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Illinois), with by far the largest concentrations in California and Texas. They tend to be young and to live in large, intact families. They are severely disadvantaged economically. Only about half of Chicano youth complete high school, and less than half of that number enter college. Their academic preparation in secondary school tends to be relatively poor and incomplete, and in college they

3. For example, the June 1983 report, *Action for Excellence*, from the Education Commission of the States includes 30 recommendations. Only one, number 26, is concerned with minority students: "States and school districts should increase the participation of young women and minorities in courses where they are underrepresented."

4. The counsel of Roy Lucero of the College Board's Santa Clara (California) office was especially valuable.

5. League of United Latin American Citizens.

6. Helen Astin is on the staff of the Higher Education Research Institute and teaches at UCLA. Cecelia Burciaga is an Assistant Provost at Stanford University.

frequently perceive needs for remediation. They typically desire to attend an inexpensive college close to home.

Recommendations, which were abstracted from those in the Ford HERI *Final Report of the Commission on the Education of Minorities* (discussed next), centered on:

> *Precollegiate Education*—for example, "encourage minority students to enroll in college preparatory curricula and to take courses in mathematics, languages, natural science, and social science;"
>
> *Community Colleges*—"revitalize the transfer function;"
>
> *Academic and Personal Support Services*—strengthen them, including ethnic studies programs;
>
> *Financial Aid*—grants rather than loans, no more than half-time work;
>
> *Bilingualism*—"examine the goals and outcomes associated with current bilingual education policy and practice;"
>
> *Minority Women*—special counseling, science and mathematics clinics, efforts to involve women who live at home in campus life.

3. *Minorities in American Higher Education* (Astin 1982) and the *Final Report of the Commission on the Higher Education of Minorities* (1982) are the two principle reports from a Ford Foundation funded Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) conducted national assessment of the status of minorities in U.S. higher education.[7] The 44-page *Report of the Commission* includes the principal findings and all the recommendations from the project.

Drawing from all the major data sources as well as several special surveys by HERI, *Minorities in Higher Education* clearly depicts the "educational pipeline" and the varying leakages across the population groups (including whites) at various transition points in the pipeline. In general, the findings confirm earlier data and suppositions. For Chicanos (Mexican Americans): 55 percent graduate from high school (compared to 85 percent of whites), 22 percent enter college (whites, 38 percent); 7 percent complete college (whites, 23 percent); 4 percent enter a postgraduate school; and 2 percent complete graduate or professional school (whites, 8 percent). More than half of all Hispanic students are enrolled in public community colleges (compared to 33 percent of white students). By field, Chicanos (and the other minorities) are most seriously underrepresented in the sciences, engineering, and mathematics. In absolute numbers, Chicano enrollment in higher education increased substantially until the mid 1970s; since then few gains have been made.

Some 66 separate recommendations are offered by Astin, his HERI colleagues, and the advisory Commission. We are concerned here mainly with those related to access (entry) to college. As already noted, several concern precollegiate education. In Astin's words:

> "A body of research shows that the quality of precollegiate education is critical in determining whether young people go on to college, what kinds of higher education institutions they attend, how they perform in college, and whether they are able to complete their college education" (p. 190).

Taking note of the disproportionate enrollment of minorities in community colleges and the line of research indicating relatively less student learning in those (overwhelmingly commuter) colleges, Astin advocates stronger efforts on behalf of potential transfer students ("the same kinds of intensive...experiences commonly available...at residential institutions").

Astin goes on to argue that in hierarchical state higher education systems with differential institutional selectivity and instructional resources (e.g., laboratories, library holdings), access to the system for minorities has in practice meant access to community colleges, with a consequent denial of the opportunities afforded by the senior institutions. The public universities are urged to seek ways to accommodate larger numbers of minorities.

Finally, in their analysis and recommendations, Astin and his colleagues give considerable attention to what they consider inappropriate uses of standardized tests. They strongly recommend that tests be used in a "value-added" framework—to assess gains in student learning—and they urge colleges to accept maximizing of value-added as their essential purpose.

The Ford HERI project, in our judgment, is an important study which, again in our opinion, has unfortunately not received the attention it deserves from policy makers either within or outside of higher education. In part this may be because of the changed mood of the country, but also, we think, because reportage of the study tended to emphasize testing issues to the neglect of other problems spotlighted by the project.

4. *Hispanics' Education and Background* (Durán 1983) is a broad-ranging review and synthesis of several lines of research related to Hispanic achievement in college. A cognitive psychologist with particular expertise in sociolinguistics, Durán has summarized:

> 1. Evidence relating family income, family obligations and concern for family well-being, and language background to educational progress;
>
> 2. Evidence on factors related to the relatively poor performance of Hispanics in secondary school (notably language and family considerations);
>
> 3. Data indicating the relatively poor performance of Hispanics on college entrance examinations, and the role of language factors; and

---

7. Alexander Astin is president of HERI; the above-named commission served in an advisory capacity to project staff. Minority populations studied included blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians.

4. Prediction studies of performance in college on the part of Hispanic students (high school grades and admission tests predict less accurately for Hispanics than for whites).

Durán offers an agenda for research centering on:

1. "...(the) academic, social, and personal preparation of Hispanics for college and the degree to which Hispanics benefit from the U.S. education system en route to college candidacy;"

2. "...the actual process by which Hispanics become college candidates, the profiles presented by Hispanic students as college candidates, and the selection processes enacted....;" and

3. "...what happens to Hispanics after they enter college...."

Also needed, according to Durán, is research on the effectiveness of various programs designed to improve minorities' "abilities to survive and succeed" in school and college.

Several other recent projects are particularly germane to the present study's focus on Mexican Americans in the Southwest.

5. In response to a legislative requirement for periodic reports on efforts to overcome minority underrepresentation in California higher education, the California Postsecondary Education Commission has now issued four reports on *Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education*. The fourth report, *Part IV* (CPEC 1982), the work of Bruce Hamlett:

1. Summarizes the current status of various minority groups in California higher education ("Chicanos continue to be more underrepresented at all levels and in all segments of postsecondary education than any other ethnic group");

2. Offers reasons for renewed effort;

3. Sets forth in considerable detail goals and activities for junior high through graduate and professional schools; and

4. Recommends ten "Priorities for Action," including (1) "strengthening college preparation of minority...students in junior and senior high schools," (2) "improving community college opportunities" (increasing program completion rates, increasing the number of transfers to four-year institutions), and (3) "improving coordination of postsecondary outreach efforts" (reducing competition among institutional recruiters for qualified minority students).

6. *The Changing Demographics of the Southwest: Data and Issues Relating to Minority Representation in Postsecondary Education in Seven Southwest States* (Kaufman, Dolman, and Bowser 1983) is an up-to-date (so far as possible) prose and tabular accounting of the status of minorities in higher education in the Southwest, organized for the most part on a comparable state-by-state basis. Census data for 1980 show the "Spanish Origin" population to be younger than any ethnic category in every state. Profiles for each state provide 1980 Census data on language spoken in the home, place of birth, school and college enrollment, year of school completed, employment status, and family income—all for five ethnic categories.

7. *Hispanic Participation in Higher Education: A Focus on Chicanos and Other Hispanics in California* is a 1982 study prepared for the California-based James Irvine Foundation by (anonymous) staff of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. Relevant national and California statistics are given; for example, between the 1970 and 1980 Census, the Hispanic population in California grew by 92 percent, to now account for about one-fifth of the state's total population. With regard to the very modest increases in Chicano enrollment in California colleges in the past five years, the report noted that:

> "When viewed against the backdrop of population growth that has made Hispanics one-fifth of the total population of the state, the minimal change in the representation of Hispanics in postsecondary education is particularly disturbing" (p.10).

A second part of the project consisted of a series of interviews on six campuses. The 15 students interviewed, when asked why so few Hispanics enrolled in senior institutions, "placed primary responsibility on poor secondary school preparation and narrow and misguided counseling." They also indicated that "a strong sense of commitment to family and community frequently competes with academic responsibilities."

8. *The Demographic Transformation of Arizona: Data and Issues Related to Minority Participation in Higher Education* (Conrad and Talbott 1983), as the title suggests, is an analysis of the ethnic composition of the state (including age by ethnicity); of English fluency; and of the educational pipeline, by minority population (with data indicating degree of underrepresentation). The authors raise questions for consideration "in framing intervention strategies" (one, in effect, asks how the state's three major universities, which are urban-based, can serve the large rural-based minority populations).

CRITICAL ISSUES

Drawing on the expanding literature on the educational experiences of Mexican Americans and other minority populations, we have identified the following issues or problems that need to be addressed—indeed resolved—if Mexican Americans are to be represented in higher education in anything like the numbers they represent in the general population.

1. It is clear that the single most important reason for the relatively low rate of Mexican American college attendance is the relatively low Mexican American secondary school completion rate. In their structure and functioning, what can secondary schools do to improve the graduation rate for Mexican American students?

2. Mexican American youth who *do* complete high school are typically less well prepared academically for colleges, compared to whites. What can the schools, at all levels, do to become more effective in imparting a college preparatory, academic education to Mexican American students?

3. Many minority youth, especially those in families with relatively little education, have difficulty imagining themselves "going to college." They need to be helped to do so, beginning at an early age. They need models and "sponsors" to start and keep them "thinking college." Might there be a role for churches, community organizations, college alumni groups, even community athletics leaders?

4. Research tends to show that English language proficiency is related to Hispanics' success in school and college. Spanish, however, is the language spoken in the majority of Hispanic households. Can families be expected to give up this part of their heritage, in order that children may be successful in the dominant culture's institutions? Is bilingual education a viable broad-scale "policy" for Hispanics in America for the foreseeable future?

5. Many Mexican Americans do not go on to higher education because of family economic circumstances. What can be done to guarantee that no student of demonstrated promise is unable to attend college for financial reasons?

6. For several years tuition has been steadily rising, as other sources of financing for higher education have been cut back. Can financial aid systems be designed such that even modest tuition increases can be counteracted and needy students not be denied access?

7. Mexican American youth, because of close family and community ties, are frequently reluctant to leave family and community to attend a distant college. Mexican American communities are often reluctant about loss of resources for the community. Can anything be done to alleviate this situation?

8. Likewise Mexican American students, with reason, frequently fear a kind of "culture shock" as they contemplate going away to college (*Los Angeles Times* 1983). What measures can a college take to provide community and otherwise ease the student into the new culture?

9. Relations between secondary schools and colleges in a given geographical area are seldom as good as they could be (Maeroff 1983). What can be done to improve the "articulation" between schools and colleges in order to smooth the transition of Mexican American high school graduates into one or another local college?

10. Mexican American students disproportionately attend public community colleges. There is evidence that these colleges, because—compared to four-year institutions—they typically have fewer resources and are nonresidential, are less effective in furthering students' educational progress than are four-year institutions. What is the validity of this contention? If true, what can community colleges do so that Mexican American students' chances of completing programs and/or transferring to a four-year institution are improved?[8]

11. Many Mexican American youth live in rural areas or in migrant camps, distant from the nearest college campus (USDA 1981). How can colleges organize to meet the needs—including seasonal work patterns—of rural Mexican youth (*cf.* Walsh, n.d.)? Indeed, how can elementary and secondary education be made more effective for rural students, even at a time when federal funds for migrant education are to be reduced?

12. The nation is presently caught up in a most heartening ground swell of concern to improve the public schools—to raise standards and otherwise achieve excellence (for reasons such as technological development, improved economic productivity, and stronger international competitiveness). Seldom in the current rhetoric of reform, however, are the special problems of educating ethnic and language minorities taken up. What can be done to assure that Mexican American and other minority students will reap the benefits from the upcoming reforms in the way that majority students surely will?

13. Beginning even earlier, a somewhat similar movement has now taken hold across the nation's colleges and universities, most commonly under

---

8. The Ford Foundation has recently announced the Urban Community College Transfer Opportunities Program, under which 25 campuses will receive grants to aid in strengthening transfer curriculums (Ford Foundation 1983; Watkins 1983).

the banner of "quality."[9] What does this trend portend for Mexican American access?

14. Perhaps the overarching issue, at least insofar as this report is concerned, inheres in the sheer numbers—and the rapidly increasing numbers—of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. Relatively young, each year more and more filling the lower schools, they will be reaching college age in great numbers in the decade ahead. What is to be the response of institutions most likely to be impacted? What is to be the response of state (taxpayer-supported) *systems* of higher education?[10] What are the options for effectively accommodating Mexican American students, whose heritage is substantially different from that of traditional students? What are the prospects for the coexistence of quality and access? Can there be an institution that is both educationally effective and pluralist?

These, then, are among the issues raised by the research literature that may be usefully considered by educators and policy makers interested in the best and fullest possible education for Mexican American and other minority youth.

We move on now to the findings from the 1982 follow-up survey, to try to discern what progress colleges and universities in the Southwest, for their part, have made in the past decade toward improving Mexican American access to college.

FINDINGS FROM THE 1982 SURVEY

In this section we present the basic results from the 1982 survey, together with comparable data from the earlier study. Each table gives the tabulations for a given question or checklist. The accompanying text comments only on highlights; readers are encouraged to study the tabular data, particularly for evidence of trends during the 1972 to 1982 period.

Several cautions, as noted earlier, need to be kept in mind in interpreting the findings from the two studies. The relatively low response rate on the second survey means that all the 1982 results need to be interpeted with care, because of various kinds of bias likely to be present in the group of 99 colleges that responded from the sample of 189 contacted. Quite possibly there is a bias in the 1982 respondent group in favor of colleges that have a relatively strong commitment to Mexican American students; that is, colleges where this is not a high priority might be disinclined to respond.

As can be seen in Appendix D, both the 1972 and 1982 groups, reflecting the 1972 sampling plan,[11] contain a disproportionately small number of public two-year and private colleges, and a disproportionately large number of four-year institutions. Compared to the 1972 respondent group, the 1982 group contained a larger percentage of public four-year and private institutions and a smaller percentage of public two-year colleges. Because of these differences in the composition of the two groups surveyed, suitable care should be taken in comparing the 1972 and 1982 results for the various subgroups of colleges.

A final caveat owes to the fact that both surveys were addressed to financial aid officers. They may be expected to provide relatively accurate information about financial aid, but possibly less accurate reports on other access-related matters, such as enrollment patterns and recruitment strategies. We do not know how many aid officers in either survey were Mexican American, and therefore how well our respondents in the aggregate may be expected to understand the population in question: potential Mexican American college students.

Text and tables are presented in roughly the order of the questions in the survey instrument, beginning with enrollment patterns and concluding with perceptions of institutional commitment to the education of Mexican American youth. For the most part, the format of the tables is the same as in the report from the 1972 study.

Enrollment

The figures in Table 1, taken from sources external to the two studies, provide an illuminating general context for the various data to be presented. The percentage of college undergraduates that are Mexican American can be seen to vary from state to state—from 5 percent of all undergraduates in Colorado in 1970 to 21 percent in New Mexico, and from 6 percent in Colorado to 27 percent in New Mexico in 1980. The percent of Mexican Americans in the total population of each state varies in somewhat similar manner.

Across the five states combined, the Mexican American proportion of the total population grew from 17 to 20 percent. While the absolute numbers of Mexican American undergraduates in the five states increased by 95 percent, from 126,000 to 246,000, the Mexican American proportion of the five-state undergraduate student population grew by only 1 percent—from 10 to 11 percent—during the decade.

---

9. *Quality—Higher Education's Principal Challenge* (Stauffer 1981), a report from the American Council on Education, is exemplary. A discussion of the role of historically black colleges is the only reference to issues of minority access and achievement.

10. In California, as noted, Mexican Americans comprise almost one-fifth of the total population. They account, however, for only 13, 11, and 4 percent of freshmen in the community college, CSUC, and University of California systems, respectively. Mexican Americans in Los Angeles increased by 155 percent between 1970 and 1983 (*Time* 1983).

11. See page 1.

Table 1. Enrollment. Total Undergraduate and Mexican American Enrollment in Southwestern Colleges in Fall 1970 and Fall 1980—By State and College Type (in thousands)

	Fall 1970				*Fall 1980*			
	Total Undergraduates	*Mexican American*	*% Mexican American*	*% Mexican American of Total State Population*	*Total Undergraduates*	*Mexican American*	*% Mexican American*	*% Mexican American of Total State Population*
State								
Arizona	74	5	7%	19%	170	14	8%	16%
California	787	65	8	16	1,353	140	10	19
Colorado	84	4	5	13	121	7	6	12
New Mexico	33	7	21	40	42	11	27	37
Texas	340	44	13	18	573	74	13	21
Total	1,319	126	10%	17%	2,259	246	11%	20%
College Type								
2-year	569	78	14%		1,572	182	12%	
4-year	610	35	6		1,342	110	8	
Private	140	13	9		***	***	***	

Sources: U.S. Census and the Office for Civil Rights publication, *Total Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education by Race, Ethnicity and Sex: State and Nation, 1980.*
***Not given.

Thus, Mexican Americans are seriously underrepresented on college campuses in the Southwest, where their proportions are roughly *one-half* that of their proportions in the total population. And during the 1970s their *under*representation *increased* slightly—from 10 versus 17 percent in 1970, to 11 versus 20 percent in 1980.

There are important state differences, to be sure. New Mexico's percentage of Mexican American undergraduates grew substantially during the period, so that in 1980 the degree of its underrepresentation was the lowest of the five states. Texas, experiencing a very large influx of Mexican Americans, lost ground during the decade. California, with a similarly large increase, stayed roughly even in terms of Mexican American enrollment in college.

At the bottom of Table 1, one can see that while many more Mexican Americans attend community colleges than public four-year institutions—182,000 versus 110,000 in 1980, the trend during the 1970s was toward a smaller Mexican American proportion in the two-year colleges (from 14 to 12 percent) and a larger percentage in the public four-year institutions (from 6 to 8 percent).

Respondents were asked to indicate factors they felt limited the enrollment of Mexican American students in their institutions. Sixty-five percent of all respondents in 1982—and 64 percent in 1972—indicated that many Mexican American students go to work instead of college because of family economic needs (Table 2). Almost half (45 percent) of all the 1982 respondents, as was the case in 1972, believed that many Hispanic students do not "see the value of going to college."

Among the community college respondents there was an increase from 1972 in the perception, first, that Mexican Americans do not apply soon enough and second, that there are insufficient special programs to serve them. Many more community college respondents in 1982 than in 1972 feel that their "institution already enrolls a proportionate percentage" of Mexican American students. Available financial aid was less often regarded as an obstacle in 1982, compared to 1972.

For the public four-year campuses, the results reported for 1982 are generally similar to those of 1972. There was a decline in the belief that these institutions already "enroll a proportionate percentage" of Mexican American students. In 1982, 61 percent of the public four-year respondents felt insufficient financial aid was a factor limiting Mexican American enrollment, compared to 51 percent in 1972.

Responses from the private schools suggest that these institutions now have many more "special programs" to serve Mexican American students. Insufficient student aid is still seen as a major barrier, though not by as many colleges as in 1972.

In general, among all respondents there is a modest (9 percent) decline from 1972 in the belief that their institutions "enroll a proportionate" number of Mexican American students. In 1982 no respondents reported that they "cannot find additional qualified students," compared

to 18 percent overall in 1972. The 1982 data likewise show a decline in the view that insufficient financial aid limits Mexican American access.

Respondents in 1982 were asked to rate the importance of possible *"barriers"* to Mexican American attendance. Table 3 presents the responses for all the colleges combined. By a substantial margin, "poor secondary school preparation" was judged the most significant barrier. Family obligations which necessitate work rather than attending college, lack of role models, and insufficient encouragement by high school counselors, teachers or parents were all also seen as important barriers.

Table 2. Enrollment. Percentage of Colleges that Indicated Various Factors that Limit the Enrollment of Mexican American Students—By College Type

	Public 2-Year		*Public 4-Year*		*Private*		*All Colleges*	
	1971–72	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*
In light of competing priorities, we have enrolled as many as we can	32	10	34	14	39	22	33	15
Insufficient financial aid available	37	28	61	51	51	41	46	41
Cannot find additional qualified students	7	**	30	**	30	**	18	**
Have not developed special programs to serve them	14	21	25	21	53	33	27	24
Not geographically accessible to large numbers of Mexican Americans	40	41	18	28	9	15	27	28
Many do not apply soon enough	21	31	32	33	20	19	23	28
Many don't see the value of going to college	52	52	52	53	43	26	50	45
Many go to work instead because of family economic needs	67	76	70	72	53	41	64	65
We already enroll a proportionate percentage	40	69	27	12	9	22	29	20
Many don't meet our admission standards	**	0	**	33	**	37	**	24

**Not given.

Table 3. Enrollment. Judged Importance of Possible Barriers to Mexican American Attendance in College—All Colleges Combined (1982 Survey Only)

	Not Important	*Of Some Importance*	*Quite Important*	*Very Important*
Poor secondary school preparation	3	14	19	63
Many don't meet admission requirements	34	25	22	19
A college degree seems unattainable	10	45	37	9
Undecided about career goals	8	36	42	14
Do not see a payoff from attending college	9	32	42	17
College sems irrelevant to the outside world	11	46	34	10
Not encouraged by high school counselors and teachers to attend college	5	26	32	36
Not encouraged by parents to attend college	5	16	38	40
Lack of role models (i.e., relatives or friends who have attended college)	3	15	42	39
Family obligations; necessity to work	0	19	40	42

Table 4. Recruitment. Percentages of Colleges Using Various Strategies to Recruit Mexican American Students—By College Type

	Public 2-Year				*Public 4-Year*				*Private*				*All Colleges*			
	1972		*1982*		*1972*		*1982*		*1972*		*1982*		*1972*		*1982*	
	frequent	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*
Used Mexican American staff recruiters	40	29	44	22	36	36	63	15	23	64	35	38	35	40	50	23
Used our Mexican American students	38	24	41	19	29	21	41	10	28	23	12	35	33	23	33	19
Made special visits to schools enrolling large numbers of Mexican Americans	49	12	59	19	55	13	78	2	53	12	46	33	52	12	64	15
Contacted Mexican American community agencies	37	21	26	26	27	23	39	20	32	20	13	38	33	21	28	26
Made specific requests to high school counselors	37	13	19	35	36	27	46	22	43	16	33	54	38	21	35	34
Publicized our special services for Mexican American students	29	35	35	42	27	39	32	32	19	47	17	63	26	39	29	43
Made special efforts to talk to parents of Mexican American students	22	25	19	30	20	34	39	17	15	41	8	38	20	31	25	26
Waived or modified admissions requirements	14	68	4	83	25	38	16	42	16	53	0	67	17	58	8	60
Waived application fees	7	59	0	92	30	36	19	50	46	45	32	40	23	50	18	59
Used Spanish language media	9	53	12	52	4	71	5	53	11	77	0	88	8	64	6	62
Used National Student Search Service	2	85	4	96	9	79	8	68	5	86	26	65	5	84	12	75

Recruitment

Tables 4 and 5 set forth information on the use of various strategies for recruiting minority students. Half of all the campuses use Mexican American staff recruiters, and one-third use Mexican American students in recruiting. Special visits to high schools enrolling large numbers of Mexican American students is the most widely used strategy at all three types of colleges.

Relatively few institutions, either in 1982 or 1972, reported using the national Student Search Service or Spanish language media to recruit students. Modification of admission requirements or application fees are likewise seldom said to be used as recruitment tools.

The general pattern of recruitment approaches is essentially the same for institutions in counties with large Mexican American populations (Table 5).

As was the case in 1972, institutions appear not to employ ethnic quota systems in the admission process or in awarding financial aid (Tables 6 and 7). Eleven percent of the 1982 respondents indicated that ethnic origin is considered in the admission process, a decline from 24

Table 5. Recruitment. Percentages of Public Colleges in Selected Counties* Using Various Strategies to Recruit Mexican American Students for Fall 1972 and Fall 1982—By College Level

	Public 2-Year				*Public 4-Year*				*All Public*			
	1972		*1982*		*1972*		*1982*		*1972*		*1982*	
	frequent	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*	*frequent*	*none*
Used Mexican American staff recruiters	73	2	56	6	58	11	93	0	69	4	74	3
Used our Mexican American students	61	12	56	13	47	5	67	0	58	10	61	6
Made special visits to schools enrolling large numbers of Mexican Americans	53	3	69	13	63	5	93	0	55	4	81	6
Contacted Mexican American community agencies	51	10	38	19	37	5	73	7	47	9	55	13
Made specific requests to high school counselors	49	5	27	27	42	11	80	0	47	6	53	13
Publicized our special services for Mexican American students	53	12	47	33	42	5	60	13	50	10	53	23
Made special efforts to talk to parents of Mexican American students	39	14	19	25	26	32	60	7	36	18	39	16
Waived or modified admissions requirements	22	63	7	87	42	21	14	36	27	53	10	62
Waived application fees	10	53	0	100	37	21	21	36	17	45	10	69
Used Spanish language media	17	29	13	47	5	53	7	29	14	35	10	38
Used National Student Search Service	5	85	7	93	16	68	8	85	8	81	7	89

*These counties include those 28 in the Southwest that, according to the U.S. Census, had at least 50,000 Mexican Americans in 1970. Approximately 72 percent of all Mexican Americans in the Southwest live in these counties.

Table 6. Recruitment. Percentage of Colleges that Undertook Various Special Procedures in 1971–72 and 1981–82 in an Effort to Enroll More Mexican American Students—By College Type

	Public 2-Year		*Public 4-Year*		*Private*		*All Colleges*	
	1971–72	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*
Earmark specific grant aid for Mexican American students	20	0	20	23	24	15	21	14
Earmark specific loan aid for Mexican American students	10	3	11	5	14	0	11	3
Earmark specific job aid for Mexican American students	18	0	11	0	14	7	15	2
Prepare special brochures or other literature for prospective Mexican American students	32	21	36	28	9	22	26	24
Consider ethnic origins in the admissions process	23	7	27	9	23	19	24	11

percent in 1972. Only 2 percent of all 1982 respondents indicated that specific job aid was designated for Mexican American students (all were private colleges). Three percent of all 1982 respondents indicated that loan aid was specifically set aside for Mexican American students. In general, the trend has been away from financial aid specially earmarked for Mexican American students.

Financial Aid

Availability of financial aid can, of course, be a critical factor in whether potential students, particularly from economically disadvantaged families, in fact enroll in college.

Coincident with the advances in minority participation in higher education in the 1970s were the massive increases in need-based student financial aid provided by the federal government. Launching of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants program (BEOG, now Pell Grants) in 1974 and the Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL) program not long after was the principal reason for the very large increases between 1972 and 1982 in total aid available (Table 8, bottom line). In fact, with the exception of NDSL at the community colleges, all forms of aid from all sources

Table 7. Recruitment. Percentage of Public Colleges in Selected Counties* that Undertook Various Procedures in 1971–72 and 1981–82 in an Effort to Enroll More Mexican American Students—By College Level

	Public 2-Year		*Public 4-Year*		*All Public*	
	1971–72	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*
Earmark specific grant aid for Mexican American students	27	0	26	25	27	13
Earmark specific loan aid for Mexican American students	17	6	16	6	17	6
Earmark specific job aid for Mexican American students	31	0	11	0	26	0
Prepare special brochures or other literature for prospective Mexican American students	59	31	58	44	59	38
Consider ethnic origins in the admissions process	32	13	47	19	36	16

*See footnote in Table 5.

Table 8. Financial Aid. Average Amounts of Undergraduate Aid Available to Institutions in 1971–72 and 1981–82 by College Type (data in thousands)

	Public 2-Year		*Public 4-Year*		*Private*	
	1971–72	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*
Federal						
Pell Grant	**	$ 447	**	$1,449	**	$ 370
EOG(1971)/SEOG(1981)	$ 51	75	$ 228	266	$108	140
NDSL	47	36	448	515	207	208
CWS	96	155	307	472	130	200
GSL	**	635	**	4,272	**	1,395
State						
Scholarships	24	70	112	464	122	600
Loans	18	19	233	620	80	465
Institutional						
Scholarships/grants	12	46	188	557	241	1,239
Loans	5	9	45	284	51	116
Jobs	47	157	264	1,075	34	65
Average aid per institution	300	1,649	1,825	9,974	973	4,798

Educational Opportunity Grants (EOG), Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), National Defense (now, Direct) Student Loans (NDSL), College Work-Study (CWS), Guaranteed Student Loans (GSL).
**Not given.

Table 9. Financial Aid. Average Estimates of Grant, Loan, and Job Aid Awarded to Mexican American Undergraduates in 1970–71* and 1980–81—By College Type**

	Grants		*Loans*		*Jobs*		*All Aid*	
	1970–71	*1980–81*	*1970–71*	*1980–81*	*1970–71*	*1980–81*	*1970–71*	*1980–81*
Average aid per institution to Mexican American full-time undergraduates								
Public 2-year	$ 25,000	$152,460	$ 17,000	$ 95,487	$ 35,000	$ 76,449	$ 77,000	$324,416
Public 4-year	106,000	447,389	139,000	350,070	92,000	137,714	337,000	935,173
Private	***	418,361	***	248,660	***	66,038	***	733,059
Average aid per Mexican American student								
Public 2-year	$ 55	$ 576	$ 40	$ 906	$ 73	$ 440	$168	$1,922
Public 4-year	176	728	233	1,231	118	1,111	527	3,070
Private	449	1,676	286	1,685	117	869	852	4,230

*Based on institutions enrolling at least 100 full-time Mexican American undergraduates.
**Based on all institutions, 70 percent of which have at least 100 Mexican American undergraduates.
***Not given.

Table 10. Financial Aid. Ratings of Possible Problems Affecting Mexican American Students Needing Financial Aid —By College Type

	Public 2-Year				*Public 4-Year*				*Private*				*All Colleges*			
	1971–72		*1981–82*		*1971–72*		*1981–82*		*1971–72*		*1981–82*		*1971–72*		*1981–82*	
	no problem	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*
Apply late or not at all	15	32	4	40	14	30	18	33	31	23	38	25	20	29	19	33
Aid application forms and "red tape"	26	27	12	8	27	11	22	27	39	4	25	4	30	17	20	16
Poor high school academic performance	33	19	29	25	32	14	32	16	32	28	30	17	33	21	31	19
Inadequate information in secondary schools regarding availability of aid	22	30	24	32	16	36	35	20	19	30	22	35	20	31	28	27
Just not enough aid to go around	25	38	20	44	21	46	26	53	22	51	46	46	23	43	30	48
Cost of application, test, and needs analysis fees	74	9	54	8	45	4	56	8	42	4	32	14	59	5	49	9

increased during the period for the two groups of colleges surveyed.

The general pattern of financial aid to Mexican American students is indicated in the top half of Table 9. The shift during the decade to aggregate reliance on grants (over other aid forms) is evident for undergraduates at both two-year and four-year colleges. *Individual* loan awards tended to be larger than the other forms of aid in 1982. Total aid packages were largest for Mexican Americans attending private colleges and lowest for those at two-year colleges, as expected. However, the *range* of differences in average aid package between Mexican American students at the three types of colleges was much smaller in 1982 than in 1972.

What proportion of all aid available to undergraduates was awarded to Mexican American students? This may be estimated for the colleges surveyed by dividing the figures in the bottom line of Table 8 into the corresponding upper-right figures in Table 9. Thus for the public two-year colleges surveyed, Mexican American undergraduates received 20 percent of all the available aid, down from an estimated 26 percent in 1972; for public four-year institutions, 9 percent in 1982 and 18 percent in 1972; at the private colleges, 15 percent in 1982 (Mexican American aid data were not available for 1972). Mexican American undergraduates, then, across all the colleges, tend to receive a disproportionately large share of available financial aid, although this share is smaller now than it was in the early (and probably middle) 1970s.

Table 10 lists several factors that could affect the process by which students obtain financial aid. Somewhat surprisingly, there were generally few differences among the respondents from the three types of colleges. Likewise, the 1982 responses do not differ greatly from 1972 data. "Just not enough aid to go around" was the judgment of roughly half of the aid officers, while another 30 percent indicated this was not a problem! Almost a third said that applying late (or not at all) was a problem, and more than one-fourth (27 percent) indicated that inadequate information in the secondary schools was a problem.

Table 11 gives comparable data for the 28 counties in the Southwest with the largest concentrations of Mexican American residents. Inadequate information in the secondary schools about financial aid reportedly declined as a problem for the four-year institutions, as did "not enough aid to go around."

Programs and Services

Table 12 sets forth a range of programs and services commonly provided by colleges and universities for educationally disadvantaged students. Eighty to 90 percent of the community college respondents reported that professional career counseling, remedial and developmental courses, veterans' assistance services, and peer tutorial assistance are provided at their institutions. These results, when compared to the 1972 survey, show major growth in remedial courses for credit, services to veterans, and peer tutorial assistance in the community colleges. Independent study labs, academic skills study centers, and single courses in Chicano studies are also more widespread. Community college respondents reported a slight decline in college preparatory summer programs and a larger reduction in college-run transportation services for students.

Among the public four-year institutions surveyed, 70

Table 11. Financial Aid. Ratings by Financial Aid Officers in Public Colleges in Selected Counties* of Possible Problems Affecting Mexican American Students Needing Financial Aid—By College Level

	Public 2-Year				*Public 4-Year*				*All Public*			
	1971–72		*1981–82*		*1971–72*		*1981–82*		*1971–72*		*1981–82*	
	no problem	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*	*no problem*	*major problem*
Apply late or not at all	2	27	7	27	5	21	8	38	3	26	7	32
Aid application forms and "red tape"	19	39	7	14	16	5	20	27	18	31	14	21
Poor high school academic performance	29	25	27	20	26	26	25	33	28	26	26	26
Inadequate information in secondary schools regarding availability of aid	8	39	13	33	16	32	36	14	10	37	24	24
Just not enough aid to go around	5	58	14	57	11	74	15	54	6	62	15	56
Cost of application, test, and needs analysis fees	80	7	50	7	37	0	43	7	69	5	46	7

*See footnote in Table 5.

to 85 percent said their institutions provided professional career counseling, veterans' assistance, peer tutorial assistance, academic study skill centers, and peer counseling service. All of these were reportedly more widespread in 1982 than in 1972. Single courses in Chicano studies and remedial courses for credit were also available on more campuses in 1982. There was a marked *decrease* in remedial and developmental courses offered for no credit.

Professional career counseling and peer tutorial assistance are the services most frequently available at the

Table 12. Programs and Services. Percentage of Colleges that Provide Various Student Support Programs and Services—By College Type

	Public 2-Year		*Public 4-Year*		*Private*		*All Colleges*	
	1971–72	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*
College preparatory summer program	44	28	45	44	28	22	40	33
Peer tutorial assistance	76	83	71	81	61	67	71	78
Peer counseling services	62	69	66	74	50	37	59	63
College-run transportation assistance	44	7	16	12	1	11	26	10
Veterans' assistance services	88	86	70	84	45	48	72	75
Chicano studies program	42	34	47	53	12	19	35	38
Single Chicano studies courses	12	52	11	40	23	26	13	39
Remedial/developmental courses—at least some for credit	55	90	14	47	4	56	38	62
Remedial/developmental courses—No credit only	36	38	84	47	93	37	62	41
Academic study skills center	60	79	46	72	27	56	48	70
Independent study lab	59	69	34	53	28	19	45	48
Specially organized developmental program	53	**	30	**	23	**	40	**
Professional career counseling	**	90	**	86	**	70	**	83
Special EOP or EOP/S program	**	62	**	42	**	4	**	37

**Item not included in survey.

Table 13. Programs and Services. Percentage of Public Colleges in Selected Counties* that Provide Various Student Support Programs and Services

	Public 2-Year		*Public 4-Year*		*All Public*	
	1971–72	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*	*1971–72*	*1981–82*
College preparatory summer program	61	31	32	56	54	44
Peer tutorial assistance	97	100	74	94	91	97
Peer counseling services	88	88	79	81	86	84
College-run transportation assistance	44	6	15	19	37	13
Veterans' assistance services	86	88	53	81	78	84
Chicano studies program	71	50	68	81	71	66
Single Chicano studies courses	15	75	16	63	15	69
Remedial/developmental courses—at least some for credit	69	94	11	69	55	81
Remedial/developmental courses—No credit only	29	31	84	56	42	44
Academic study skills center	63	94	53	81	60	88
Independent study lab	59	81	42	69	55	75
Specially organized developmental program	61	**	37	**	55	**
Professional career counseling	**	100	**	94	**	97
Special EOP or EOP/S program	**	81	**	75	**	78

*See footnote in Table 5.
**Not given.

private institutions. These campuses reported an increase during the decade in remedial courses for credit and in operation of academic skill study centers. There was a marked decline at these institutions in peer counseling and remedial courses without credit.

Achievement

Various factors conceivably related to academic achievement of Mexican American college students are given in Table 14. Many, as was seen in the section "Recent Literature on Hispanic Access and Achievement," have been identified in the research literature. Of the factors listed, "good academic preparation in secondary school" was judged to be the most important. Achievement in college is also judged to be related to "English reading and writing proficiency," with over half the aid officers believing this factor to have a "strong effect." Provision of effective student services was also perceived as promoting academic achievement among Mexican American students.

Table 14. Achievement. Judged Importance of Various Factors that May Affect Academic Achievement of Mexican American Students—All Colleges Combined (1982 Survey Only)

	No Effect	*Minor Effect*	*Substantial Effect*	*Strong Effect*
Good academic preparation in secondary school	**	4	27	69
English reading and writing proficiency	1	6	41	52
Well-designed remedial courses	12	23	45	20
Student has clear career goals	1	27	41	30
Practical experiences (e.g., internships) available	14	43	28	14
Ability to fit in or relate to the mainstream culture of the campus	15	30	32	23
Effective student services: financial aid office, career counseling, etc.	5	13	42	39
Existence of special support programs for Hispanics: clubs, peer tutoring/counseling, etc.	11	22	39	27

Table 15. Attrition. Judged Importance of Various Factors that May Affect Attrition Among Mexican American Students—All Colleges Combined (1982 Survey Only)

	No Effect	*Minor Effect*	*Substantial Effect*	*Strong Effect*
Inadequate academic preparation	8	31	39	23
Limited proficiency in English	20	49	25	5
Students are burdened with remedial courses	48	46	25	5
Transfer to another institution	19	60	16	4
Poor academic performance	6	39	40	15
Lack of clear career goals	12	42	35	11
Never planned to obtain a degree or complete a program	33	40	20	8
Desire for practical experiences	23	47	20	9
School work viewed as not relevant to the student's real interests	21	53	22	3
Offer of a good job	30	45	21	4
Financial problems	3	24	45	28
Difficulties with bureaucratic procedures involved in receiving financial aid	27	44	22	7
Dissatisfaction with the institution	19	65	10	7
Inability to fit in or relate to the mainstream culture of the campus	23	48	18	11
Transportation problems/expenses	26	51	16	7
Family problems/emergencies	14	48	31	7
Marriage or marriage plans	26	64	9	1
Student/family moved away from the area served by the institution	48	44	7	1

Factors such as opportunities for practical and field experiences and the ability to "fit into" the mainstream campus culture were not thought to have particular effect on academic achievement.

Attrition

In the opinion of financial aid staff, three factors strongly contributed to the attrition of Hispanic students (Table 15): "inadequate academic preparation," "financial problems," and "poor academic performance." The burden of remedial coursework, bureaucratic difficulties in securing financial aid, marriage plans, nd family problems were judged as having little or no effect.

Faculty and Student Services Personnel

Average numbers of full-time Mexican American faculty and student support staff were calculated from the 1982 data. As shown in Table 16, all three types of institutions reported more Mexican American professionals in faculty positions than in other categories such as financial aid and admissions work. Because they are generally larger, the public four-year institutions tend to employ larger numbers of Mexican American professors—11 on the average. Community colleges, on the other hand, employ relatively larger numbers of Mexican Americans as counselors and advisors.

Table 16. Faculty and Student Services. Average Number of Full-Time Mexican American Professionals per Institution (1982 Survey Only)

	Public 2-Year	*Public 4-Year*	*Private*	*All Colleges*
Financial aid	.72	.95	.28	.70
Admissions	.48	1.05	.43	.71
Advising and counseling	1.72	.98	.44	1.05
Other student services (e.g., EOP, EOPS, Dean of Students Office)	1.31	2.60	.93	1.77
Faculty	5.00	11.27	2.50	7.00

Table 17. Future Commitment to Mexican American Students. Anticipated Change in Institutional Commitment to Mexican American Students*

	Public 2-Year	*Public 4-Year*	*Private*	*All Colleges*
No change/none	14	23	26	21
General affirmation of commitment to Mexican Americans	7	18	15	14
Increased effort: specific measures cited	17	18	**	13
Decreased commitment for financial reasons	7	9	**	6
No answer	55	30	59	45

*Written comments were grouped into five categories.
**Not given.

Future Commitment to Mexican American Students

The final item in the survey asked respondents to write out, in open-ended fashion, ways that they expected their institution's commitment to the education of Mexican American students to change over the next two years. Comments were coded into five categories, as shown in Table 17. (Comparable data are not available from the 1972 survey.) Almost half of all the respondents declined to comment. The largest number of those who did comment do not expect their institution's commitment to change. One in seven of the colleges indicated a kind of general affirmation of commitment, while a similar number (which included no private colleges) reported specific measures toward stronger commitment.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

In this section we will briefly summarize the general patterns of results from both the 1972 and 1982 surveys and point to a number of implications that bear on improved access of Mexican Americans to higher education in the U.S.

We believe that now is a particularly critical time to address issues in the higher education of Mexican Americans. The 1972 survey was taken as the tide of Mexican American access was on the upswing. It probably reached its zenith as a higher education priority in the years 1975 to 1977. The 1982 survey was made as the tide of concern is receding somewhat, as other priorities (e.g., reestablishment of academic standards) are given greater weight. Thus it is important that questions of Mexican American access be resourcefully considered now, so that the important gains made during the 1970s will not be lost.

It is also important that the authors of this report be explicit about their assumptions. As will be evident in the implications that follow, we assume, first, that higher education is in the interests of *all* who can benefit from it, as well as of the nation as a whole (we are not impressed by "overeducation" arguments). Second, we assume that the higher education provided by mainstream colleges and universities in the U.S.—products for the most part, as they are, of Anglo culture—is in the interests of Mexican American youth.

The summaries and implications that follow are stated in highly abbreviated form. The format of this report unfortunately does not enable suitable discussion of the many exceptions and qualifications to the general con-

clusions drawn. On particular points of interest, readers are encouraged to consult some of the longer volumes listed in the References.

Enrollment

We saw that while Mexican American enrollment in higher education in the Southwest nearly doubled during the 1970s, their numbers, as a percentage of total enrollment, increased by only 1 percent—from 10 to 11 percent. When compared to their proportion in the total population—17 percent in 1972, 20 percent in 1983—the magnitude of their underrepresentation, which *increased* during the decade, becomes quite clear. The situation varies by state: New Mexico made the strongest gains during the 1970s, and Mexican Americans in that state, compared to the other five, are now the least underrepresented in higher education. With huge and increasing numbers of Hispanics (including immigrants from Central America), Texas lost ground during the decade, and California held roughly even (Mexican Americans in the total population proportionately twice that of their higher education enrollment, in both 1970 and 1980).

By type of institution, the data indicate that Mexican Americans have become better represented at four-year institutions, while the two-year colleges lost ground slightly during the 1970s, from 14 to 12 percent.

When asked to indicate probable barriers to Mexican American enrollment, two-thirds of the financial aid officers checked "many go to work instead because of family economic needs," and four in ten indicated "insufficient financial aid...." In another list of barriers to access, "poor secondary school preparation" was the most widely perceived barrier by a substantial margin, followed by "family obligations; necessity to work," lack of parental encouragement, "lack of role models...," and lack of encouragement by teachers and counselors.

At least four implications may be drawn:

1. Mexican American students continue to be seriously underrepresented in higher education in the Southwestern states (with New Mexico somewhat an exception). To improve this situation:
2. The secondary school preparation of Mexican American students must be greatly strengthened;
3. The size of financial aid awards must be increased;
4. Families and school staff must offer stronger encouragement to "go to college" to Mexican American students judged to have academic potential.

Recruitment

Both the 1972 and 1982 surveys asked aid officers to indicate use of various strategies for recruiting Mexican American students. Extent of use of the various approaches, of course, differed, ranging in 1982 from "special visits to schools enrolling large numbers of Mexican Americans," cited as frequently used by two-thirds of the respondents, down to "used Spanish language media," cited by only six percent.

Overall, the pattern of shifts since 1972 in the use of various recruitment strategies was one of mixed increases and decreases. On balance, there was probably a decline (most likely from a peak in the mid-1970s) in the use of various recruitment procedures that were covered in the two surveys.

Compared to the two-year and private colleges, the four-year institutions, especially in the counties with high concentrations of Mexican Americans, reported impressive increases in the use of various strategies for recruiting Mexican American students.

Needless to say, if increased Mexican American access is to be a key institutional goal, extraordinary resourcefulness needs to be brought to devising and implementing recruitment strategies.

Financial Aid

Average amounts of financial aid available to the campuses, we saw, increased substantially between 1972 and 1982—by a factor of five to seven (unadjusted dollars) depending on type of college—due in large part to the federal Basic Educational Opportunities Grants (BEOG) and Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL) programs launched in the mid-1970s. Financial aid from state and institutional sources also expanded, though in smaller measure compared to federal aid.

It was found in the colleges surveyed that Mexican Americans received from 9 to 20 percent, depending on type of college, of the total financial aid available to undergraduates, a share that was down somewhat from 1972.

As was noted in the section "Findings from the 1982 Survey," the practice of "earmarking" student aid specifically for Mexican American students has declined substantially since the 1972 survey. This seems a clear example of the shift away from the "affirmative action" climate of the early and mid-1970s.

With regard to possible problems encountered in obtaining financial aid, there was generally little change between the 1972 and 1982 studies. "Apply late or not at all" was still the chief complaint in 1982, as in 1972. "Cost of application, test, and needs analyses" was seen as somewhat more of a problem in 1982, particularly in the community colleges.

While it is, of course, a truism that there is never enough aid to go around, it may be argued on grounds of social equity that Mexican American students, so frequently from families of extreme economic deprivation, are deserving of relatively large aid packages (to compensate

for reduced family contributions), mainly in the form of grants, as Olivas (1981) has argued.

Programs and Services

While there have been increases in remedial courses for credit, career counseling, peer tutorial assistance, and veterans' assistance among the institutions surveyed, overall progress across the total range of student support programs and services is mixed. Our conclusion is that the overall availability of such programs and services is not substantially different now from 1972, a conclusion that seems also to hold in institutions in counties with large Mexican American populations. Community colleges evidenced the greatest growth in availability of services, as well as the largest variety of services.

Availability of special support programs and services at institutions in the Southwest can and should be increased. If the lack of postsecondary achievement among Mexican American students can be attributed to an inadequacy in the development of basic learning skills, then support programs that focus on building academic abilities are essential to the success of these students.

Many institutions in the Southwest have fully developed programs for Mexican American students. For example, summer "bridge" programs which assist the student in preparing for the college environment and the academic rigor required have been successful at many universities. Institutions need to share the experiences of successful programs.

Faculty and Student Services Personnel

Presence of Mexican American faculty and staff would most certainly render a given campus more attractive—potentially more comfortable—for prospective Mexican American students. Mexican American professionals then become crucially needed role models for Mexican American students, once they are on campus.

The 1982 survey indicated an average of 11 to 12 Mexican American faculty and staff on campuses in the Southwest. While there obviously are differences by location, type and size of institution, the numbers in general are extremely small.[12] By means of all conceivable measures, they need to be greatly increased.

Achievement and Attrition

While this project is focused on questions of access, rather than achievement and attrition, the reputation that a college or system of colleges has, based on solid achievements of its students, including Mexican American students, can have a strong impact on recruitment and enrollment patterns.

We saw that "good academic preparation in secondary school" and "English reading and writing proficiency" were judged to be the most important factors underlying college achievement, and in various places in this report we have pointed to the need to strengthen both of these. From a list of factors possibly affecting attrition, "financial problems" was the most widely seen difficulty, and we have stressed the need for larger financial aid awards to qualified Mexican American students.

Future Commitment

What might we conclude when almost half (45 percent) of the 1982 respondents chose to give no answer when asked about future institutional commitment to Hispanic students? Quite likely, many were honestly uncertain of their institution's stance on this matter, a situation that would not have existed in the early and mid-1970s.

One in five reported "no change" in future institutional commitment, and about one in seven generally affirmed their commitment to Hispanic access; these results are also difficult to interpret. More clearly, only about one in eight campuses (13 percent, including no private colleges) reported specific steps on behalf of Hispanic students, and 6 percent reported "decreased commitment, for financial reasons."

From this pattern of responses, we presume that increased access for Mexican American youth is not an important goal for a good many colleges and universities in the Southwest in the 1980s, and as an institutional priority, has probably (in the absence of comparable 1972 data) declined since 1972.

Somehow, even in the face of the various counterforces cited, Mexican American access must be reaffirmed as a critical goal for state higher education systems in the Southwest and especially for institutions located in areas of high Mexican American population density.

Greater Effort Needed by Colleges, Schools, and Mexican American Families

Colleges and universities in the Southwest can do more, and should do more, to attract Mexican American students. Especially, they can improve recruitment strategies, strengthen support services, and increase the numbers of Mexican American staff. Because so many Mexican Americans enroll in public community colleges, these institutions must become vehicles for genuine achievement on the part of minority students, not places where many are "cooled out."

However, the extent of additional effort by the colleges and universities is probably limited, because of: limited financial resources, the current emphasis on conventional concepts of institutional quality and academic standards,

12. Nationally, in 1975, Hispanics accounted for 1.4 percent of full-time faculty, and 1.5 percent of administrative staff (Brown et al. 1980).

and a sense on many campuses of lowered priority for minority interests.

The schools, especially the secondary schools, must work, as has been stressed throughout this report, to strengthen the academic preparation of Mexican American students. Further, the school reforms of the mid- and late 1980s *must* redound to the benefit of Mexican American and other minority students as well as to whites.

Mexican American families and communities must continue to give importance to the education of their youth Unquestionably, this will not be easy given the economic deprivation of many Mexican American families. Mexican American youths must be oriented toward education, including higher education, at an early age, and parents, community groups, and local cultural norms must be actively supportive.

English Language Proficiency

Although results of relevant research are not completely consistent, the preponderance of evidence indicates that proficiency in English is related to access to and achievement in higher education. This is hardly surprising, given that English is the language commonly used in academic discourse, and that college instructors are commonly Anglos.

Elementary school bilingual programs designed to facilitate learning of English are proving to be successful in many localities. Drawing on successful experience, bilingual programs should be inaugurated or strengthened, as the case may be, in schools throughout the Southwest. There should be no question about their objectives: to strengthen conceptual understanding and to increase English proficiency. Mexican American families and communities should continue to support acquisition of strong English language skills by their youth.

REFERENCES

Astin, A.W. 1982. *Minorities in American Higher Education*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, H.S., and Burciaga, C.P. 1981. *Chicanos in Higher Education: Progress and Attainment*. Los Angeles, Calif.: Higher Education Research Institute.

Baron, A., Jr. (Ed.) 1981. *Explorations in Chicano Psychology*. New York: Praeger.

Brown, F., and Stent, M.D. 1977. *Minorities in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education*. New York: Praeger.

Brown, G., Rosen, N., Hill, S., and Olivas, M. 1980. *The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Cabrera, Y.A. 1978. *Minorities in Higher Education: Chicanos and Others*. Niwot, Colo.: Sierra Publications.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. 1982. *Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part IV*. Sacramento, Calif.: Author.

Carter, T., and Segura, R. 1979. *Mexican Americans in School: A Decade of Change*. New York: College Board.

Commission on the Higher Education of Minorities. 1982. *Final Report of the Commission on the Higher Education of Minorities*. Los Angeles, Calif.: Higher Education Research Institute.

Conrad, D.F., and Talbott, M. 1983. *The Demographic Transformation of Arizona: Data and Issues Related to Minority Participation in Higher Education*. Tuscon, Ariz.: University of Arizona.

De los Santos, A.G., Jr., Montemayor, J., and Solis, A., Jr. 1980. *Mexican-American/Chicano Students in Institutions of Higher Education: Access, Attrition and Achievement*. Austin, Tex.: Office for Advanced Research in Hispanic Education.

Durán, R.P. 1983. *Hispanics' Education and Background: Predictors of College Achievement*. New York: College Board.

Education Commission of the States. 1983. *Action for Excellence*. Boulder, Colo.: ECS Task Force on Education for Economic Growth.

Estrada, L.F. 1983. *The Dynamic Growth and Dispersion of the Latino Population*. Los Angeles, Calif.: Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of California at Los Angeles.

Ferrin, R.E., Jonsen, R.W., and Trimble, S.S. 1972. *Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest*. Higher Education Survey Report No. 6. New York: College Board.

Fisher, K. 1982. *Getting into College: A Survey of Changing Admission Requirements in Western Public Higher Education*. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Ford Foundation. August 1, 1983, Help for Community Colleges. *Letter*. 14(4), 1.

Godsell, G. April 29, 1980. The Chicanos. *Christian Science Monitor*.

Goldman, R., and Hewitt, B. 1976. Predicting the Success of Black, Chicano, Oriental and White College Students. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 13(2), 109–117.

Hill, S., and Froomkin, J. 1980. *Characteristics of Hispanic Postsecondary Students*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Kaufman, N.S., Dolman, G., Jr., and Bowser, B.P. 1983. *The Changing Demographics of the Southwest: Data and Issues Relating to Minority Representation in Postsecondary Education in Seven Southwest States*. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Kissler, G.R. 1980. Trends Affecting Undergraduate Education in the University of California. Presented at the Board of Regents of the University of California, October 16, 1980.

La Red/The Net. 1982. A Special Review Symposium of *Minorities in American Higher Education*. Issue No. 60. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research.

Laosa, L.M. 1983. *Social Policies toward Children of Diverse Ethnic, Racial and Language Groups in the United States* (RR-83-29). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Lowman, R., and Spuck, D. 1975. Predictors of College Success for the Disadvantaged Mexican-American. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 16, 40–48.

Lopez, R., Madrid-Barela, A., and Macias, R. 1976. *Chicanos in Higher Education: Status and Issues*. Monograph No. 7. Los Angeles: University of California, Chicano Studies Center.

Los Angeles Times, June 22, 1983. Chicanos Jilted by Ivy League.

Macroff, G.I. 1983. *School and College: Partnership in Education* (especially, Chapter VI, Minorities: A Shared Mandate). Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Munroe, B.H. 1981. Dropouts from Higher Education: Path Analysis of a National Sample. *American Educational Research Journal*, 18(2), 133–141.

Nielsen, F., and Fernandez, R. 1981. *Achievement of Hispanic Students in U.S. Schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Olivas, M. 1979. *The Dilemma of Access*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

———. 1981. *Financial Aid: Access and Packaging Policies for Disadvantaged Students*. Program Report No. 81-B14. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, December.

Ornstein-Galicia, J. 1981. Varieties of Southwest Spanish. In R.P. Duran (Ed.), *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Preer, J.L. 1981. *Minority Access to Higher Education*. AAHE-ERIC Research Report No. 1, Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Ramist, L. *College Student Attrition and Retention*. (College Board Report No. 81-1). New York: College Board.

Reeves, R. 1981. Boyle Heights and Beyond. *New Yorker*, September 14, 57(30), 116–156.

Stauffer, R.M. 1981. *Quality—Higher Education's Principal Challenge*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Teschner, R., Bills, G., and Craddock, J. 1975. *Spanish and English of United States Hispanos: A Critical, Annotated Bibliography*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Time. Los Angeles, June 13, 1983. America's Uneasy New Melting Pot. 18–23.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. 1972. *Teacher and Students: Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students*. Report V: Mexican American Education Study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

United States Department of Agriculture. 1981. *The Education of Nonmetro Hispanics*. Washington, D.C.: Economics Management Staff Publications, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Walsh, S.V. Congressional Testimony about the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP). Austin, Tex.: St. Edward's University, no date.

Warren, J. 1976. *Prediction of College Achievement among Mexican-American Students in California*. College Board Research and Development Report. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Watkins, B.T. 1983. Urban Community Colleges Revamp Programs for Students Transferring to Universities. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 12, 1983, 12.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. 1980. *Representation of Minorities in Higher Education in the West*. Boulder, Colo.: WICHE.

The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. 1982. Hispanic Participation in Higher Education: A Focus on Chicanos and Other Hispanics in California (A Study for the James Irvine Foundation). Princeton, N.J.: Author.

Appendix A. Advisory Committees

The group responsible for defining the topics and outlining specific questions for the 1972 survey included the following:

Arnulfo Oliveira, Chairman
President, Texas Southmost College
Brownsville, Texas

Isaac Cardenas, Director
Project STAY
San Antonio, Texas

Raul Cardoza, Assistant Dean of Admissions
Occidental College
Los Angeles, California

Thomas Carter, Dean of Education
California State University
Sacramento, California

Leo Munoz, Staff Psychologist
Valle del Sol
Phoenix, Arizona

Feliciano Rivera, Professor of History
California State University
San Jose, California

Willie Sanchez, Vice President for External Affairs
New Mexico Highlands University
Las Vegas, New Mexico

Atelano Valencia, Associate Professor of Education
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Advisors for the 1982 survey included:

Roy Lucero, Assistant Director
The College Board
Santa Clara, California

Alfredo de los Santos, Vice Chancellor for Educational Development
Maricopa County Community College
Phoenix, Arizona

Joe Adam Maestras, Director of Special Services
University of California
Irvine, California

Higher Education Surveys

DIRECTIONS: Local usage of terms for Spanish Surnamed Americans varies greatly; in this questionnaire the term "Mexican American" is used and should be regarded as synonymous with "Spanish American", "Latin American", or "Chicano". Please answer each question, and, if you wish, explain any answer in the "Comments" space on the back. Call 415-328-6150 collect to clarify any question. PLEASE RETURN BY JUNE 16.

(1) Rate all of the following factors that you feel are problems affecting Mexican American students who need financial aid.

Rate each: 1—not a problem
2—somewhat of a problem
3—a major problem

Apply late or not at all . . . . . ( )
Aid application forms and "red tape" . . . . . ( )
Poor high school academic performance . . . . . ( )
Inadequate information in secondary schools regarding availability of aid . . . . . ( )
Just not enough aid to go around . . . . . ( )
Cost of application, test, and needs analysis fees . . . . . ( )

(2) Please enter the amount of aid awarded to Mexican American undergraduate students in 1970-71, the amount received for ALL undergraduates in 1971-72, and the level of funding requested and expected to be received for ALL undergraduates in 1972-73.

		1970-71* Amt. awarded to Mex. Americans	1971-72 Amt. received for all undergrads	1972-73 Level of funding requested for undergrads	1972-73 Amt. expect to receive (est.)
Federal	EOG				
	CWS				
	NDSL				
State	Scholarships				
	Loans				
Institution	Schlrshp/Grants				
	Loans				
	Jobs				

*Fill in as many cells in this column as possible

(3) In 1971-72 did your institution: (Check if yes)

Earmark specific grant aid for Mexican American students? . . . . . ( )
Earmark specific loan aid for Mexican American students? . . . . . ( )
Earmark specific job aid for Mexican American students? . . . . . ( )
Prepare special brochures or other literature for prospective Mexican American students? . . . . . ( )
Consider ethnic origins in the admissions process? . . . . . ( )

For the remaining questions you may wish to consult with the Admissions Director or other appropriate staff.

(4) How often has your institution used the following approaches to attract Mexican American students for new [illegible]?

Rate each: 1—not at all
2—occasionally
3—frequently

Used Mexican American staff recruiter(s) . . . . . ( )
Used our Mexican American students . . . . . ( )
Made special visits to schools enrolling large numbers of Mexican American students . . . . . ( )
Contacted Mexican American community agencies . . . . . ( )
Made specific requests to high school counselors . . . . . ( )
Publicized our special services for Mexican American students . . . . . ( )
Made special efforts to talk with parents of Mexican American students . . . . . ( )
Waived or modified admissions requirements . . . . . ( )
Waived application fees . . . . . ( )
Used Spanish language media (i.e., radio, newspapers) . . . . . ( )
Used national Student Search Service . . . . . ( )

(5) In your opinion which of the following factors limit the enrollment of Mexican American students on your campus? (Check all that apply)

In light of competing priorities, we have enrolled as many as we can . . . . . ( )
Insufficient financial aid available . . . . . ( )
Cannot find additional qualified students . . . . . ( )
Have not developed special programs to serve them . . . . . ( )
Not geographically accessible to large numbers of Mexican Americans . . . . . ( )
Many do not apply soon enough . . . . . ( )
Many don't see the value of going to college . . . . . ( )
Many go to work instead because of family economic needs . . . . . ( )
We already enroll a proportionate percentage . . . . . ( )

OVER

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6 Which of the following programs and services does your institution provide? (Check all that apply)

College preparatory summer program . . . . . ( )
Peer tutorial assistance . . . . . ( )
Peer counseling services . . . . . ( )
College-run transportation assistance . . . . . ( )
Veterans assistance services . . . . . ( )
Chicano studies program . . . . . ( )
Single Chicano studies courses . . . . . ( )
Remedial/developmental courses (Circle: credit or no credit) . . . . . ( )
Academic study skills center . . . . . ( )
Independent study lab . . . . . ( )
Specially organized developmental program . . . . . ( )
Other (Please specify:_____)

7 Give the NUMBER of regular full-time new freshmen and undergraduate enrollment for the past two fall terms. What is your best estimate for next fall?

	New Freshmen		Undergraduates	
	All	Mex American	All	Mex American
Fall 1970				
Fall 1971				
Fall 1972 est.				

8 Give the number of Mexican American full-time professionals in the following areas at your institution.

Financial Aids_____ Admissions_____ Guidance & Counseling_____

Other Student Services (i.e., EOP, SSDS, Dean of Students office)_____

Faculty_____

9 In what ways, if any, do you expect your institution's commitment to Mexican American students will change over the next two years?

All things considered, it will probably be about the same as it is now.
Yes_____ No_____ If no, please explain.

COMMENTS: Use this space to explain any answer

Name _____

Institution _____

Use prepaid envelope provided—Return to:

College Entrance Examination Board
Access Research Office
800 Welch Road
Palo Alto, California 94304

HISPANIC ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTHWEST

NAME: _____

TITLE: _____

INSTITUTION: _____

_____

Number of Years as a Financial Aid Director ____

DIRECTIONS: Local usage of terms for Spanish surnamed Americans varies greatly; in this questionnaire the term "Hispanic" is used and should be regarded as synonymous with "Mexican American," "Latino," or "Chicano." Please answer each question and, if you wish, explain any answer in the blank space on the back of the questionnaire. You may want to consult with the Director of Admissions or other staff in responding to certain of the questions. If you need clarification about any aspect of the study, call Dr. Rose Payán at ETS in Berkeley: (415) 849-0950, Ext. 214. Please return this form in the enclosed envelope, by May 15, to:

Educational Testing Service
1947 Center Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

We very much appreciate your cooperation.

1. Please enter the total amount of aid received for ALL undergraduates in 1980-81 and the amount awarded to Hispanic undergraduates. For each aid category, also enter the number of recipients.

		1980-81 Amt. received for ALL undergraduates ($)	1980-81 Number of students receiving each (#)	1980-81 Amt. awarded to Hispanics ($)	1980-81 Number of Hispanics receiving each (#)
Federal	Pell Grant (Basic Grant)				
	SEOG				
	CWS				
	NDSL				
	GSL				
State	Scholarships				
	Loans				
Inst.	Scholarship/Grants				
	Loans				
	Jobs				
	Other: (Specify)				

2. Please enter similar information for the 1981-82 academic year.

		1981-82 Amt. received for ALL undergraduates ($)	1981-82 Number of students receiving each (#)	1981-82 Amt. awarded to Hispanics ($)	1981-82 Number of Hispanics receiving each (#)
Federal	Pell Grant (Basic Grant)				
	SEOG				
	CWS				
	NDSL				
	GSL				
State	Scholarships				
	Loans				
Inst.	Scholarship/Grants				
	Loans				
	Jobs				
	Other: (Specify)				

3. Enter the level of funding requested for all undergraduate student aid in 1982-83, and the amount expected to be received.

		1982-83	
		Level of funding requested for All undergraduates	Amt. expect to receive (estimate)
Federal	Pell Grant (Basic Grant)		
	SEOG		
	CWS		
	NDSL		
	GSL		
State	Scholarships		
	Loans		
Inst.	Scholarship/Grants		
	Loans		
	Jobs		
	Other: (Specify)		

Check if yes

4. In 1981-82, did your institution:

Earmark specific grant aid for Hispanic students? ( )

Earmark specific loan aid for Hispanic students? . ( )

Earmark specific job aid for Hispanic students?. . ( )

Prepare special brochures or other literature for prospective Hispanic students? . . . . . ( )

Consider ethnic origin in the admissions process? ( )

5. Rate all of the following factors that you feel are problems affecting Hispanic students who need financial aid.

1 - not a problem
2 - somewhat of a problem
3 - a major problem

Apply late or not at all . . . . . ( )

Aid application forms and "red tape" . . . . . ( )

Poor high school academic performance . . . . . ( )

Inadequate information in secondary schools regarding availability of aid . . . . . ( )

Just not enough aid to go around . . . . . ( )

Cost of application, test, and needs analysis fees . . . . . ( )

Others: _____ ( )

_____ ( )

Check if yes

6. In your opinion, does the availability of the Spanish Financial Aid Form encourage Hispanic students to apply for financial aid? . . . . . ( )

7. Would audio-visual materials in Spanish assist you in informing Hispanic students about financial aid availability? . . . . . ( )

8. Would training in practices and procedures for serving Hispanic students be beneficial to you? . ( )

Comments: _____

_____

9. How helpful would the following types of training be to you in serving Hispanic students?

1 - Not helpful
2 - Somewhat helpful
3 - Quite helpful
4 - Extremely helpful

Training in:

The present status of Hispanic students in higher education . . . . . ( )

Procedures for early counseling of Hispanic students . . . . . ( )

Developing procedures for establishing contacts and networks in the Hispanic community . . . . . ( )

Increasing skills in determining financial aid eligibility for Hispanic students . . . . . ( )

Identifying external sources of funding specifically earmarked for Hispanic students . . . ( )

Strategies for recruiting Hispanic students to your institution . . . . . ( )

Others: _____ ( )

_____ ( )

10. Please give the number of regular full-time new freshmen and total undergraduates for the past two fall terms. Also, what are your best estimates for the fall of 1982?

	New Freshmen		Undergraduates	
	All	Hispanic	All	Hispanic
Fall 1980				
Fall 1981				
Fall 1982 estimate				

11. How often has your institution used the following approaches to attract Hispanic students next fall?

1 - not at all
2 - occasionally
3 - frequently

Used Hispanic staff recruiter(s) . . . . . ( )

Used our Hispanic students . . . . . ( )

Made special visits to schools enrolling large numbers of Hispanic students . . . . . ( )

Contacted Hispanic community agencies . . . . . ( )

Made specific requests to high school counselors . . . . . ( )

Publicized our special services for Hispanic students . . . . . ( )

Made special efforts to talk with parents of Hispanic students . . . . . ( )

Waived or modified admission requirements . . . . ( )

Waived application fees . . . . . ( )

Used Spanish language media (e.g., radio, newspapers) . . . . . ( )

Used the College Board's Student Search Service . ( )

Other: _____ ( )

_____ ( )

12. Which of the following programs and services does your institution provide for Hispanic students? (Check all that apply)

College preparatory summer program . . . . . ( )

Peer tutorial assistance . . . . . ( )

Peer counseling services . . . . . ( )

Professional career counseling . . . . . ( )

Remedial/developmental courses: for credit . . . ( )

Remedial/developmental courses: not for credit . ( )

Academic study skills center. . . . . ( )

Independent study lab . . . . . ( )

Special EOP or EOP/S program . . . . . ( )

Chicano or Hispanic studies program . . . . . ( )

Single Chicano/Hispanic studies courses . . . . . ( )

Veterans assistance services . . . . . ( )

College-run transportation assistance . . . . . ( )

Other services used by Hispanic students:

_____

_____

13. We wish to assemble rough baseline data on current attrition rates for Hispanic undergraduates, by class or year level and by gender. In the table below, please give, first, the numbers of students enrolled for the fall term in 1980 (on the left side); then (on the right side) give the figures (or your best estimates) of the numbers of those students who were again enrolled in the fall of 1981. For example, how many freshman Hispanics in the fall of 1980 were re-enrolled in the fall of 1981?

	Numbers of Hispanic students enrolled for the fall 1980 term			Number of those students enrolled during the fall 1981 term		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Freshman (first year)						
Sophomore (2nd year)						
Junior (3rd year)						

14. In your opinion, to what extent do the following factors affect attrition among Hispanic students on your campus?

1 - Has no effect on attrition on our campus
2 - Has a minor effect
3 - Has a substantial effect
4 - Has a very strong effect on attrition

Inadequate academic preparation . . . . . ( )

Limited proficiency in English . . . . . ( )

Students are burdened with remedial courses . . . ( )

Transfer to another institution . . . . . ( )

Poor academic performance . . . . . ( )

Lack of clear career goals . . . . . ( )

Never planned to obtain a degree or complete a program . . . . . ( )

Desire for practical experiences . . . . . ( )

School work viewed as not relevant to the student's real interests . . . . . ( )

Offer of a good job . . . . . ( )

Financial problems . . . . . ( )

Difficulties with bureaucratic procedures involved in receiving financial aid . . . . . ( )

Dissatisfaction with the institution . . . . . ( )

Inability to fit in or relate to the mainstream culture of the campus . . . . . ( )

Transportation problems/expenses . . . . . ( )

Family problems/emergencies . . . . . ( )

Marriage or marriage plans . . . . . ( )

Student/family moved away from the area served by the institution . . . . . ( )

Other factors: _____ ( )

_____ ( )

15. In your opinion, which of the following factors limit the enrollment of Hispanic students on your campus? (Check all that apply)

In light of competing priorities, we have enrolled as many as we can . . . . . ( )

Insufficient financial aid available . . . . . ( )

Have not developed special programs to serve them . . . . . ( )

Not geographically accessible to large numbers of Hispanics . . . . . ( )

Many don't meet our admission standards . . . . . ( )

Many don't apply soon enough . . . . . ( )

Many don't see the value of going to college . . . ( )

Many go to work instead because of family economic needs . . . . . ( )

We already enroll a proportionate percentage . . . . . ( )

Other: _____ ( )

_____ ( )

16. In your opinion, how important are the following factors in promoting academic achievement of Hispanic students on your campus?

1 - Has no effect on achievement on our campus
2 - Has a minor effect
3 - Has a substantial effect
4 - Has a very strong effect on achievement

Good academic preparation in secondary school . . ( )

English reading and writing proficiency . . . . . ( )

Well-designed remedial courses. . . . . ( )

Student has clear career goals. . . . . ( )

Practical experiences (e.g., internships) available . . . . . ( )

Ability to fit in or relate to the mainstream culture of the campus . . . . . ( )

Effective student services: financial aid office, career counseling, etc. . . . . ( )

Existence of special support programs for Hispanics: clubs, peer tutoring/counseling, etc. . ( )

Other: _____ ( )

_____ ( )

17. Generally speaking, how important are the following possible barriers to Hispanic attendance in college?

1 - Not important
2 - Of some importance
3 - Quite important
4 - Very important

Poor secondary school preparation . . . . . ( )

Many don't meet admissions requirements . . . . . ( )

A college degree seems unattainable . . . . . ( )

Undecided about career goals . . . . . ( )

Do not see a payoff from attending college . . . ( )

College seems irrelevant to the outside world . . ( )

Not encouraged by high school counselors and teachers to attend college . . . . . ( )

Not encouraged by parents to attend college . . . ( )

Lack of role models (i.e., relatives or friends who have attended college) . . . . . ( )

Family obligations; necessity to work . . . . . ( )

Other: _____ ( )

_____ ( )

18. Please give the numbers of full-time Hispanic professionals in the following areas at your institution.

_____ Financial aid

_____ Admissions

_____ Advising and counseling

_____ Other student services (e.g., EOP, EOPS, Dean of Students Office)

_____ Faculty

19. In what ways do you expect your institution's commitment to Hispanic students will change over the next two years or so?

Appendix D. Part 1: Survey Respondents, 1972 and 1982

1972	*1982*	*Arizona*
x	x	Arizona State University
x	x	Arizona Western College
x		Cochise College
x	x	Eastern Arizona College
x	x	Glendale Community College
x	x	Maricopa Technical College
x	x	Mesa Community College
x		Navajo Community College
x		Northern Arizona University
x		Phoenix College
x		Pima College
x	x	Prescott College
x	x	Scottsdale Community College
x		University of Arizona
		California
x		California Institute of Technology
x	x	California Maritime Academy
x	x	California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
x	x	California State College, Bakersfield
x		California State University (CSU), Chico
x	x	CSU, Dominguez Hills
x		CSU, Fresno
x	x	CSU, Fullerton
x	x	CSU, Hayward
x	x	CSU, Humboldt
x		CSU, Long Beach
x		CSU, Los Angeles
x	x	CSU, Northridge
x	x	CSU, Sacramento
x		CSU, San Bernardino
x	x	CSU, San Diego
x		CSU, San Jose
x	x	CSU, Sonoma
x	x	CSU, Stanislaus
x	x	California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
x		City College of San Francisco
x	x	Claremont McKenna College
x		Cogswell Polytechnical College
x		College of Marin
x	x	Columbia College
x		Compton College
x		Cosumnes River College
x		Cuesta College
x	x	Diablo Valley College
x	x	Dominican College

1972	*1982*	
x	x	Don Bosco Technical Institute
x		East Los Angeles College
x	x	Feather River College
	x	Fresno Pacific College
	x	Glendale Community College
x		Golden Gate College
x	x	Grossmont College
x		Hartnell College
	x	Harvey Mudd College
x		Imperial Valley College
x		Laney College
	x	Los Angeles Baptist College
	x	Los Angeles Harbor College
x		Los Angeles Valley College
	x	Los Medanos College
	x	Loyola Marymount University
	x	Marymount Palos Verdes College
x	x	Merced College
	x	Mission College
x		Modesto Junior College
x	x	Mount St. Mary's College
x		Mount San Jacinto College
	x	National University
	x	New College of California
x		Occidental College
	x	Palo Verde College
	x	Palomar Community College
x		Pasadena City College
x		Pepperdine College
x		Pitzer College
x		Sacramento City College
	x	San Diego City College
x		San Diego Mesa College
x		San Jose College
x	x	Shasta College
	x	Simpson College
x		Skyline College
x	x	Solano Community College
x		Southern California College
	x	Southwestern College
	x	Stanford University
x	x	Taft College
x	x	University of California (UC), Berkeley
x	x	UC, Davis
	x	UC, Riverside
x		UC, San Diego
x		UC, Santa Cruz
x	x	University of the Pacific
x		University of Southern California

Appendix D. Part 1: Survey Respondents, 1972 and 1982 (Continued)

1972	*1982*	
x		Ventura College
x		West Coast University
	x	Westmont College
		Colorado
x	x	Aims College
x	x	Adams State College
x		Arapahoe Community College
x		City College of Denver, North Campus
x		City College of Denver, West Campus
x	x	Colorado College
x		Colorado Mt. College, East Campus
x		Colorado Mt. College, West Campus
x		Colorado School of Mines
x		Colorado State University
x		El Paso Community College
x		Lamar Community College
x	x	Loretto Heights College
x	x	Mesa College
	x	Metropolitan State College
x		Northeastern Junior College
x	x	Otero Junior College
	x	Pikes Peak Community College
x		Rangely College
x	x	Regis College
x		Southern Colorado State College
x		Temple Buell College
	x	Trinidad State Junior College
x		University of Colorado, Boulder
	x	University of Colorado, Colorado Springs
x		University of Denver
x	x	University of Northern Colorado
	x	University of Southern Colorado
x	x	Western State College
		New Mexico
x	x	College of Santa Fe
x	x	Eastern New Mexico University, Roswell
x		New Mexico Junior College
x		New Mexico Highlands University
x	x	New Mexico Institute of Mining & Technology
x	x	New Mexico State University (NMSU), Alamogordo
	x	NMSU, Carlsbad
	x	NMSU, Las Cruces
	x	University of Albuquerque
x	x	University of New Mexico
	x	Western New Mexico University
		Texas
x	x	Abilene Christian College
	x	Alvin Junior College
	x	Amarillo College
x	x	Angelo State University
	x	Bishop College
	x	Blinn College
	x	Brazosport College
	x	Central Texas College
	x	Cisco Junior College
x		Dallas Baptist College
x	x	East Texas State University
	x	El Centro College
	x	Fot Worth Christian College
	x	Galveston College
	x	Grayson County College
	x	Houston Baptist College
	x	Howard County Junior College
	x	Howard Payne University
	x	Incarnate Word College
	x	Lamar University
	x	Laredo Junior College
	x	Midwestern University
x	x	North Texas State University
	x	Odessa College
	x	Pan American University
	x	Panola Junior College
	x	Paris Junior College
	x	Paul Quinn College
	x	Prairie View A & M College
	x	Rice University
	x	Saint Mary's University
x	x	Sam Houston State University
	x	San Antonio College
	x	Southwest Texas Junior College
	x	Southwest Texas State University
	x	Southwestern University
	x	Stephen F. Austin State University

Appendix D. Part 1: Survey Respondents, 1972 and 1982 (Continued)

1972	*1982*		*1972*	*1982*	
x	x	Sul Ross State University	x		Texas Woman's University
x	x	Tarleton State University	x		Trinity University
x	x	Texas A & I University, Kingsville	x		University of Houston
x	x	Texas A & M University, College Station			University of Houston at Clear Lake
	x	Texas A & M University at Galveston	x		University of Texas, Arlington
x		Texas College	x	x	University of Texas, Austin
x	x	Texas Southern University	x	x	University of Texas, El Paso
x	x	Texas Technological University	x		University of Saint Thomas
			x	x	West Texas State University

Part 2: The Population of Southwestern Colleges and the 1972 and 1982 Respondent Groups— By State and College Type

	*All Colleges**		*1972 Respondents*		*1982 Respondents*	
	N	%	*N*	%	*N*	%
Arizona						
Public 2-year	11	3	9	6	6	6
Public 4-year	3	1	3	2	1	1
Private	2	1	1	1	1	1
California						
Public 2-year	92	26	26	17	15	15
Public 4-year	28	8	22	14	17	18
Private	60	17	12	8	15	15
Colorado						
Public 2-year	14	4	12	8	4	4
Public 4-year	9	3	7	5	7	8
Private	5	1	5	3	3	3
New Mexico						
Public 2-year	7	2	4	3	2	2
Public 4-year	6	2	5	3	2	2
Private	2	1	2	1	1	1
Texas						
Public 2-year	46	13	12	8	3	3
Public 4-year	22	6	22	14	16	16
Private	47	13	11	7	6	6
Totals	354	101	153	100	99	101
Totals by College Type						
Public 2-year	170	49	63	41	30	30
Public 4-year	68	19	59	39	43	43
Private	116	33	31	20	26	26

*As of 1972.